

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-13, and rejected claims 1-2 and 4-13, and objected to claim 3. With this response, no claims are amended, and new claims 14-16 are added. The newly added claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Supporting structure for the functions recited in new claims 14-16 can be found at least at page 8, lines 4-21; page 8, line 23—page 9, line 3; and Figure 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

At section 3, on page 2 of the Office Action claims 1-2, 7-8 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Chuah (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0214928). Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Chuah, because Chuah fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Chuah at least fails to disclose or suggest a method for supporting data exchange between terminal equipment and a mobile communication network via a mobile terminal, wherein the terminal equipment and the mobile terminal are separate entities, as recited in claim 1. In addition, Chuah also at least fails to disclose or suggest that an indication of a cause of a failure is received from the mobile communication network, and forwarded to the terminal equipment, as recited in claim 1.

Chuah relates to a method for paging a device in a wireless network. Chuah discusses providing a wireless packet-switched data network for end users that avoids the public switched telephone network and provides end users of the wireless network with remote roaming capability. See Chuah paragraph [0071]. Claim 1 recites a method for supporting a data exchange between terminal equipment and a mobile communication network via a mobile terminal, said terminal equipment and said mobile terminal being separate entities. However, Chuah does not disclose or suggest supporting data exchange between terminal equipment and a mobile communication network via a mobile terminal.

While Chuah does mention that end systems 232 (for example a portable PC) connect to a wireless network 230 via external or internal modems, these modems are not both separate from the terminal equipment and mobile. Chuah discusses that these external and internal

modems allow end systems 232 to send and receive over an air link. However, the external modems are generally fixed, i.e. not mobile, since external modems are co-located with roof-top mounted directional antenna, and the internal modems are integral with the end systems, and therefore not separate. See Chuah paragraph [0074]. As such, Chuah fails to disclose or suggest a method for supporting a data exchange between terminal equipment and a mobile communication network via a mobile terminal, said terminal equipment and said mobile terminal being separate entities. For at least this reason, Chuah does not anticipate or suggest claim 1, because all of limitations recited in claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested.

Furthermore, Chuah also fails to disclose or suggest that an indication of a cause of a failure is received from the mobile communication network, and forwarded to the terminal equipment, as recited in claim 1. Chuah discloses that when a personal computer user submits a connection request via a wireless modem, the connection request is converted into a network layer registration message that is transmitted across the airlink to the base station (AP). See Chuah paragraph [0221]. Each connection request specifies a delay requirement, a bandwidth requirement, and a traffic descriptor so that the base station may first compute various performance metrics, e.g. total bandwidth consumed, average delay, in order to determine whether admission of a new connection could cause a failure to meet to quality of service for those connections. If the quality of service of all admitted connections can be maintained with the admission of a new connection, the new connection is admitted, if not, the new connection request is denied. See Chuah paragraph [0222].

In contrast, claim 1 recites a method in which the mobile terminal receives from the terminal equipment a request to establish a connection to the mobile communication network for exchanging data, and the mobile terminal forwards the request to the mobile communication network. If a failure occurs concerning the requested connection and an indication of the cause of failure is received from the mobile communication network the mobile terminal forwards the indication to the terminal equipment. For example, such an indication enables the terminal equipment to inform a user, who could then change the request in a promising way. Chuah only discloses that a connection may be denied, but fails to disclose or suggest that an indication of a cause of a failure is forwarded from a mobile communication network to the terminal equipment. In Chuah, the decision on whether a connection request is admitted or denied is made on the

network side based on the quality of service requirements, and there is no indication provided as to the cause of failure, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Chuah fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1, and claim 1 is not anticipated or suggested by Chuah.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, and is not disclosed or suggested by Chuah at least in view of its dependency.

Independent claims 7-8 and 11-12 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claims 7-8 and 11-12 are not disclosed or suggested by Chuah.

#### Claim Rejections Under § 103

At section 5, on page 3 of the Office Action claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chuah in view of Rao et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0076128). Claims 4 and 9 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

At section 6, on page 3 of the Office Action claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chuah. In making the rejections to claims 5 and 10 the Examiner take Official Notice that saving/storing information in a mobile equipment for later use has been well known in the art. Claims 5 and 10 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

At section 7, on page 4 of the Office Action claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chuah in view of Chou (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,526). Claim 6 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, and is patentable over the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Independent claim 13 contains limitations similar to those recited in independent claim 1, therefore for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claim 13 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Furthermore, Chuah in view of Chou, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 13.

New Claims 14-16

New claims 14 and 15 contain limitations similar to those recited in independent claims 7 and 8, and are novel and nonobvious over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to independent claims 7 and 8.

New claim 16 depends from new independent claim 15, and is new and nonobvious over the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Allowable Subject Matter

At section 8, on page 4 of the Office Action claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant does not wish to amend claim 3 to place the claim in independent form at this time.

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The undersigned believes that no additional fee is required to submit this response, but hereby authorizes the Commission to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith R. Obert  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 58,051

Date: 8 August 2006

KRO/kas  
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234  
FAX: (203) 261-5676  
Customer No. 004955